1895-96
(L. R.)

File No. 95 of 95

Sub:— Shanbhogi claim of ~~Lakshmi~~ Lakshminarappa of Nandena hosahalli and Village with Siddagatta Taluk.

P. F. 102 of 98

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1895 – 1896

File No. 95 of 95

191 .

Serial Nos. 1—12

(L. R.)

Later references.

L. R. 95 of 98.

LR 95—41—1

LR 478—41—36

LR 156—43—13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

LR 95—41—3.

Serial Nos. 1—12

Major ~~Part B~~ for May 1899

Claim SUBJECT.

Shanbhogi ~~office~~ of Laksminarasappa of Nandenahosahalli and ~~four~~ other Village in the Sidlaghatta Taluk.

Countermarked.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 - 28-1-19

P. F. 102 of 98

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1895 – 1896

File No. 95 of 95

191 .

Serial Nos. 1—12

(L. R.)

Later references.

L. R. 95 of 98.

LR 95—41—1

LR 478—41—36

LR 156—43—13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

LR 95—41—3.

Serial Nos. 1—12

Major ~~Part B~~ for May 1899

Claim SUBJECT.

Shanbhogi ~~office~~ of Lakshminarasappa of Nandenahosahalli and ~~four~~ other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk.

Countermarked.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 - 28-1-19

OF MYSORE — SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

REVENUE BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT. Shanbogi office of Nandanahosahalli and 4 other villages in the Siddaghatta Taluk.

LAST REFERENCE. Letter No. 907/219 dated 19th August 9[5] from the Dy Commr, Kolar.

In Septr 1895, the Dy Commr brought to notice that one Lakshminarasappa, a clerk in the Sub Registrar's office, Bangalore, was the registered holder of the aforesaid Shanbogi office, that a gumasta nominated by him was performing the duties of the office for a time and that that gumasta having resigned his appointment, Lakshminarasappa

† No 1250 & 296 14-9-1895

Lakshminarasappa ~~nomi-~~
-nated another man as Gumasta
& requested that the nominee
be permitted to officiate
for him (Shanboque), as he himself
could not perform the
duties, ~~himself~~ being em-
ployed elsewhere. The Dy.
Commr therefore Solicited
instructions as to whether
the registered holder should
be required to perform the
duty himself or resign his
office, or a competent Gumasta
appointed by him should
discharge the Shanboguc
duties.

2. The Dy Commr's ~~the~~ report
being incomplete, information
was called for on the following points: —

(i) When ~~did~~ Lakshminarasappa
entered Govt Service & ceased
to perform his duties as Shanboque?

(ii) Whether he was allowed to
employ a Gumasta for a
definite or indefinite period?

(iii) Whether there is any record
to Shew that he was led

No 3651
R. 1438

-time in Govt Service as long as he ~~chose~~ those without forfeiting his right to the Shanboque office.

3. From the papers now Submitted, the following facts are gathered: —

1stly Regarding Lakshmi-narnappa's Govt Service } In February 1873, Lakshi-narasappa was appointed Registration Sumasta in the Magadi Taluk. There he was transferred to the Closepet Taluk, & subsequently ~~wherein he was trans-ferred~~ to the Bangalore Sub Registrar's office in August 18[illegible]

Please See paper No. 9 —

2dly Lakshminarnappa's Shanboqueship — } Up to the year 1884, one Seebaiya was the Shanboqu of the 11 villages named below: — Nandayahosahalli, Nalla-dasenahalli, Patarlahalli, Yerramaradihalli, Anmata-halli, Jodirguhalli, Poli-naikanahalli, Dodda-guttahalli, Jodi Rangé-nahalli, Seegalgatta &

Paper No. 10.

Rangavarannu.

" February 1884, Seebaiya requested that his brother Seshagiriappa and another Narsingappa might be appointed as Shanbogues of Yerramaradibalii & Ammatahalli and Changaiyarahalli & Segalgatta respectively, & his brother's son Lakshmi-narasappa be appointed as Shanbogue of the other 7 villages. Lakshminara-sappa requested that as he could not perform the duties of the Shanbogue office, his brother Krishnappa might be appointed as his gumasta. Lakshminarasappa's brother Jwalapataiya requested that his name be registered as the Shanbogue of Yerramara-dibalii & Ammatahalli villages. The Dy Commr sanctioned the above arrangements on the recommendation of

× Please see extracts from the Registers Paper No. 10 in the file. The original order is said to be not forthcoming -

Valladasenahalli
Doddaguttahalli
Potarlahalli
Polanaikanahalli
Jodi Rangenahalli
Jodi Ramhalli.

Please Lakshminarasappa's Statement (Paper no. 14) & the Amildar's report (Paper no. 1.)

-narasappa became the Registered holder of the Shanboge office of 7 villages, and Krishnappa was re-cognized as his Gumasta. During the Survey Settle-ment the villages nos. 2 & 3 were amalgamated with no. 1, & the total no of villages in charge of the Shanboque became 5. Krishnappa is stated to have contin-ued as Shanboque Gumasta for ½ a period of 5 or 6 months, after which he resigned the post. One Rangama then Succeeded him & performed the duties of the Gumasta for 7 years and a half. He having resigned the post on account of old age, one Seenappa Succeeded him and after a Service of 3 years & a half

gave up his appointment in June 1895.
The nomination of the last
two persons as Gumastas by the Shanbogue
does not appear to have
been Sanctioned by the
Dy Commr. ~~of the Taluk.~~ He
Seems to have
Amildar himself permitted this arrangement
in anticipation of Sanction.
The present Amildar reports
that the original papers
relating to this are not
forthcoming, except entries
in the registers Shewing
that Takids were issued to
the Sheikdar to ~~extract~~ take
work from the Gumastas.
After Seenappa resigned his appointment,
the Taluk authorities issued
a notice to Lakshminara-
Sappa & called upon him
to nominate a gumasta
in place of Seenappa. On
the 22d August 1895 he
nominated one Subbama

in the presence of the
Amildar. Again on the
24th August 1895, Lakshm
-narasappa represented
to the Amildar that Sub-
-banna was unable to
perform the duties owing
to some family inconvenien
and nominated one Soor-
-appa, the son of Rangapp
who was also ~~the~~ Gumast
for some time, and the
Amildar recommended
this arrangement for the
approval of the Dy Comm
Lakshminarasappa
now prays that, hereafter
brother Jwalapataiya,
who is the Shanbogue
of Yevvamardihalli and
Ammatihalli, may be
appointed as ~~the~~ Gumasta,
he being paid Rs 36 annual
out of the Potgi payable

to him (Kanakamma) 11)

The Amildar says that Jwalapataiya is a permanent resident of Nandanahosahalli village, & that he can be placed in charge of the 5 villages in question in addition to the two small villages of which he is the registered Shanbogue.

4. From the foregoing facts it will be observed that Lakshminarasappa never performed the Shanbogue's duties, & that from the time he became the registered Shanbogue of the 5 villages, there has been a succession of Gumastas performing the duties of the office, of whom only the first one was recognized by the Dy Commr. There is nothing in the Dy Commr's order* of 1884 which can be taken to authorize the Shanbogue

* Extract from the Register —

gumastas one after an-
-other, as long as he likes.
Para 5 of Rule XLIII permits
the appointment of gumastas
in two cases, ie, when the
Registered holder of the Office
is a widow, or a minor.
In the same rule it is said
that the holder of a vil-
-lage office should be
able to perform the duties,
otherwise the Dy Commr
should appoint the next
heir in law competent to
hold the office. The case
under reference does not
come under any of the
above classes. The Shan-
-boque is competent to do
the duties, but is employed
elsewhere & therefore wants
a gumasta to be appointed
for the discharge of the
duties. In the rule above
quoted it is said that

hereditary principle cannot be allowed to override administrative necessities. It is a matter for consideration whether a man can remain in Govt Service and at the same time draw Potgi for Shanbogue Service which he does not perform on the ground that the latter office is hereditary. Attention is respectfully invited to the Secretary's remarks on the Dy Commissioner's letter No 1250 of 14th September/95.

29/9

Submitted for orders.

23/9/96 26/9/96

Noted to Secy GA
29/9/96

Noted by Secy (r) A
29-9-96

The remarks of the Secy are quite in accordance with mine. The office of village registrar as an official should not be honorary distinction. The right is inseparable from the duty of undertaking the work - the only exceptions allowed by rules are those of a minor - the village official has no such disabilities. He cannot resign as a Shanbogue is permitted to be permitted to absent himself for other employment. He may be called upon to perform the duties of the other - If the Shanbogue prefers to remain in Govt service he ought to resign the Shanbogue in favour of his next of kin. Orders.

Submitted
30.9.96

Lakshminarasappa

~~Pet~~ applied for review of the above order on the following grounds

(1) That he had paid heavily in making good the monies embezzled by the original huk dar

(2) That when he was registered as huk dar he was known ~~Dhe~~ to be of ~~bad~~ service & that since the date of registry four gumastas had successively performed their duties

(3) That in the Madras & Bombay Presidencies as well as in Mysore, registered thumboques were ~~getting them~~ allowed to do their duty by deputy

Pet was thereupon asked to state (1) his present age (2) the probable date of his retirement (3) whether he has sons or other heirs.

Pet states

(1) that he ~~age~~ is about 44 years old;

(2) that he may probably retire within 15 years

(3) that he has an only son aged 18 prosecuting his studies in Bangalore

From para 15 of the order No 178 of the Standing orders of the Board of Revenue (Miscellaneous), it appears that hereditary village officers may hold private & or govt appointments and perform their duties by a competent deputy, the whole of the emoluments being paid to the latter.

The Bombay rules on the point do not seem to be easily accessible

M 23/8/97

Rd 7 Bn.
23.8.97

Pass
Hy 21/12/97

If Peters will be the right person to make the enquiry in the name of his son, & as he is only 18 & prosecuting studies a Journalist may be permitted to do the work for a year or two within which time he will qualify himself by passing & obtaining for work. If the Peters is not willing, he must abide by the order already passed & must

17.12.97

This question has been withdrawn by the Indian Act III of 1895 & the rules thereunder

Hy 22/4/98.

The rules are given in Bombay Act III of 1874

Hy 22/4/98.

20/12/97

The petr has presented a
2nd review appl. and
prays that he may be
permitted to employ a
gumasta till he retires
from public Service
The petr admits that
a 2nd review petn is
inadmissible but says
that an "unparalleled
injustice" has been
done to him.
So far as the petr's remarks
relating to Madras are
concerned, they are wrong.
the right of doing
the duties by proxy has been
withdrawn by Madras Act
III of 1895 (vide Copy
of Board's proc. filed).

The proc book is in the Library)

As regards Bombay the
Watandari Act- no doubt
recognises the right of a
hereditary to do duties by
a guncata but this is said
to have been due to the fact
that some of the Watandars in the Southern Mahratta Country
were Jaghirdars whom
it would have been difficult
to expel- to duty in person
(I remember having read this
explanation in Baden-Powell's
Land Systems of British India)

22/4/99

I think the order
already passed
is correct and need
cannot be revised
24.4.99

I believe a further ref= on the
same subject ~~from Govt~~ was
subm. to 2nd Cr a few days ago & wait
till it is rec. back BR
1.5.99

Resp. no 1720 and despatch
2/5/99 mfg.

3/5/99

Subd to 2nd Commissioner

In my humble opinion, if the registered Shanbhog is unable to perform his duties owing to his employment elsewhere, he should be required to resign the office in favour of one of the other hakdars if any. In the absence of such hakdar, the office should be at the disposal of Govt. A Shanbhog should not, I submit, be permitted to return his licence on his office and employ one substitute after another, for an indefinite period and so long as he chooses to find other employment for himself either in Govt. or otherwise.

In the present case, the Dy. Commissioner's Report does not favour us full.

information as to
when the Thackray
ceased Government
ceased to perform
their duties as Thackray
whether he was quite
sane & what became
whether he was allowed
to employ a Gumasta
for a definite or
indefinite period
& whether there is
any record to show
that he was led to
believe that he
could continue
the Government as
long as he chose
without forfeiting
his right to the office
of Thackray.

5/10/95

Rec'd
7/10
Secret information
Under
9/10/95

draft

Draft confirmation

(2)

To
The Asstt. Collr.
Kolar

L.R. 95-95-1

Dated: 12-10-95
18

VO: 365-1
R 1438

Ref Asstt Collrs Letter No: 1250
dated 14th September 1995
Soliciting instructions
regarding the Shanbhogi
Office of Nandanahosa
halli & 4 other villages
in the Sidlaghatta Taluk

With reference to the above
has the honor to observe
that sufficient informa
tion is not forthcomi
ng to enable the Govt: to
pass final orders in
the matter. The Dy
Com

is hereby requested
to furnish further
information ~~on~~ on
the following points —

1. When did Shan-
bhog Lakshmi narsappa
enter Govt. service
and cease to perform
his duties as Shanbhog.

2 Whether he was granted
any and if so, what
leave and whether
he was allowed to
employ a gumasta
for a definite or
indefinite period.

3 Whether there is
any record to show
that he was led to
believe that he
could continue in
Govt. service as
long as he chose,
without forfeiting
his right to the
Shanbhogi office.

By order

12/10/95

Gen. 31]



From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

To Revenue

The Secretary to the Government Dewan of Mysore.

L.R. 105-97

Dated 14th September 1895

Despatched 17th Do.

Received

General No. 1250

No. 296 L.R. 95-95-2

Enclosure No.

Soliciting instructions as to whether the holder of the office of Shanbhoge in Nadamahosahally + 4 other villages in Gunjpunte Hobli of Siddaghatta Taluq is required to do the work himself or which to give up the office or has a right to appoint a Competent Immediate for the discharge of the duties of the Post-

Recd 19-9-95.
Rev. Br. BR

Submitted for orders.
BB
23/9

Cord 25/9

Submitted Dr. Councillor.

In my humble opinion if the registered Shanbhog is unable to perform his duties owing to his employment elsewhere, he should be required to resign the office in favour of one of the other Shanbhogs - if any. In the absence of such Shanbhogs the office should be at the disposal of Govt. & Shanbhog should not, I submit, be permitted to return to his office & to employ one substitute after another, for an indefinite period as long as he chooses to pursue other employment for himself either in Government or otherwise.

In the present case, the Deputy Commissioner does not

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's
Office, Dated 14th September 1895.

To

The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that Lakshmi-
-narasappa, Shanbhogue of Nandanahosa-
halli and 4 other villages in the Ganjigunte
Hobli of the Siddaghatta Taluk is employed
as a clerk in the Sub-Registrar's office, Ban-
galore. The duties of the Shanbhogi office
were performed for a few years by a gumas
ta, nominated by the registered holder and the
former having since resigned, the latter has
nominated another Gumasta and pro-
poses that his new nominee may be
permitted to officiate for him.

2. The provisions contained in para 5
Section 43 of the Land Revenue Rules
do not seem to contemplate cases of
this kind.

3 The Barawardar who is fit to perform
the

the duties is unwilling to do so having taken up service elsewhere.

4. I beg therefore to solicit the favour of instructions as to whether in this and other similar cases the holder of the office can be required to do the work himself or to give up the office, or whether he has a right to appoint a competent Gumasta for the discharge of the duties of the post.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.—

Deputy Commissioner

Kolar district.

Seen

Gen. 31.]

1806

REGD. NO. 1407
Vol. 126
24 AUG 96 082
DEWAN'S OFFICE

~~L.R. 102-97-2~~

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district

To Revenue and General
The Secretary to the Government
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

L.R. 98-95-3

Dated/9th August 1896
Despatched 21st
Received
General No. 907
No. 219
Enclosure No. 1 file

Reporting on the Chamboque
office of Vandanahosahalli
&c. Siddaghatta district

Ref 11
24/8 Rec'd 25/8
Rec'd

The Rs. quoted herein belongs to the Rev. Branch.
26/8 To Rev Br. Rec'd 26/8

Rep to no 6.7
Send inter office note
28/8

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's office

Dated 19th August 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Revenue and General Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your docket No. 3651/R1438 dated 12th October 1895 calling for further information regarding the Shanbhogi office of Kandana hosahalli and other villages in the Siddaghatta Taluk, I have the honor to state that Shanbhog Lakshminarasappa entered Government service on the 14th February 1873 and he never performed the duties of Shanbhog nor did he join his office.

2. Lakshminarasappa whose name was registered as Shanbhog in 1884 seems to have been allowed to employ a Gumasta for an indefinite time which may probably have led him to believe that he was absolute

in Government Service as long as he chose without forfeiting his right to the Shanbhogi office.—

3 The first Gumasta appointed was the Shanbhog's younger brother Krishnappa and his appointment was approved by the Deputy Commissioner in 1884. The Gumasta-ship appears to have since changed hands without the sanction of this office. It is now reported by the Amildar that the Shan-bhog wishes to nominate his elder brother Jwalapathiah as his gumasta and that he prays for the approval of this nomination

4. The vernacular papers as per accom-panying Fairist are herewith submitted for reference and obliging return when no longer required.—

5 It is a question for Government to decide whether in such case the

next hukdar should not be appointed to the office when the registerdar fails to perform the duties being otherwise employed.

I have the honor to be,
Sir.
Your most obedient servant.

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

(4)

L.R 103-97-3

Read:—

Correspondence ending with letter No 907/219 dated 9th August 1896 from the Dy Commr, Kolar District, on the Subject of the Shanbogue office of Nandanahosahalli and 4 other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk. ~~the Registered holder of which is Nanjappa~~ ~~is a client in the Sub Re-~~ ~~-gistrar's office, Bangalore.~~

Ruled 24 (vi) 27-10-96

L.R. 95-95-4

No 4087-94 / R. 1406 dt 1-11-96

Order thereon:—

The papers Submitted by the Dy Commr. Shew that Lakshminarasappa ~~Nanjappa~~, The Bara Ward on Shanbog has been in Government Service from since February 1873 & that he became the registered Shanbogue of the villages in question in 1884. Since then the duties of the

Shanbogue office are being performed by the gumastas appointed by Lakshmiarasappa ~~Narasappa~~ from time to time. He now requests that ~~as he cannot perform the duties himself, being employed elsewhere,~~ his brother Krishnappa who is the registered Shanbogue of certain other villages, may be appointed to officiate for him ~~Narasappa~~ as gumasta. The Dy Commr in soliciting instructions as to whether Lakshmiarasappa ~~Narasappa~~ should be required to perform the duty himself or resign his office, or a competent gumasta nominated by him should may be permitted to discharge the Shanbogue duties ~~on the ground that~~ (the provisions contained in the Rev: Rules do not seem to contemplate cases of this kind. points out that

Who is now a clerk in the Bangalore Sub-Registrar's Office,

2. Government observe that the registry of the name of a person as an officiator Shanbogue is not an honorary distinction. The right to a Shanbogi office is inseparable from the ~~duty~~ efficient discharge of duties connected therewith, the only exception allowed by para 5 of ~~Rule~~ Section XLIII of the Mysore Land Rev: Rules, ~~Registered holders of Shanbogue offices can appoint Gumastas~~ being in the case of ~~if they are~~ widows or minors, on whose behalf Gumastahs may be appointed. The officiator Shanbogue in the present case ~~under reference~~ has no such disability; ~~He cannot therefore contend~~ and he cannot, being ~~to be~~ a registered Shanbogue be permitted to ~~also~~ absent himself for employment elsewhere. He should therefore be called upon to select the one or the

other. If he prefers to remain in Government Service elsewhere, he should resign his hak to the Shan-bogue office in favour of his next of kin.

3. The Dy Commr is requested to give effect to the above orders.

17/10/96

Permit — 27-10-96.

Secretary

3/10. 30/10/96

To.

The Dy Commr.
Kolar District
returning the enclosures.

" Dy Commrs father visits for information and guidance —

Subd to Secty

30/10/96

Yes — but submit permit prior to approval

Office Submit. Draft Order for approval before issue thereof

1-11-96

READ :—

Correspondence ending with letter No. 907--219, dated 19th August 1896, from the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar district, on the subject of the shanbhog office of Nandanahosahalli, and four other villages in the Sidlaghatta taluk.

No. 4087-94—R. 1406, DATED, BANGALORE, 1ST NOVEMBER 1896.

ORDER THEREON.—The papers submitted by the Deputy Commissioner show that Lakshminarasappa, the baravardar shanbhog, has been in Government service since February 1873, and that he became the registered shanbhog of the villages in question in 1884. Since then the duties of the shanbhog office are being performed by gumastas appointed by Lakshminarasappa from time to time. He now requests that his brother Krishnappa, who is the registered shanbhog of certain other villages, may be appointed to officiate for him as gumasta. The Deputy Commisisoner, in soliciting instructions as to whether Lakshminarasappa, who is now a clerk in the Bangalore Sub-Registrar's office, should be required to perform the duty himself or a competent gumasta nominated by him may be permitted to discharge the shanbhog duties, points out that the provisions contained in the Revenue Rules do not seem to contemplate cases of this kind.

2. Government observe that the registry of the name of a person as an officiator shanbhog is not an honorary distinction. The right to a shanbhogi office is inseparable from the efficient discharge of duties connected therewith; the only exception allowed by para 5 of Section XLIII of the Mysore Land Revenue Rules being in the case of widows or minors on whose behalf gumastas may be appointed. The officiator shanbhog in the present case has no such disability, and he cannot, being a registered shanbhog, be permitted to absent himself for employment elsewhere. He should therefore be called upon to elect the one or the other. If he prefers to remain in Government service elsewhere, he should resign his *hak* to the shanbhog office in favor of his next of kin.

3. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to give effect to the above orders.

C. SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar district, returning the enclosures.
The Deputy Commissioners of other districts for information and guidance.

Exd.—H.A.R.

1896-97

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

REVENUE

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 1st November 1896

No. 4087-94 / R. 1406

Observing in the case of Lakshminarasappa, the baravardar shanbhog of Nandanahosaballi and four other villages in the Sidlaghatta taluk, now a clerk in the Bangalore Sub-Registrar's office, that a baravardar shanbhog cannot both be in Government service and continue to be the registered shanbhog getting the duties of the office performed by a gumasta.

M.G.C.P.B.—16-11-96—120

L.R. 103-97-4

1897

No. 36366/97.

Name of Petitioner A. Lakshmi Narasappa Shanbogue & a Clerk in the Collector's Sub-Treasury Office Bangalore

Village Kaddaba Bangalore.

Taluk Bangalore.

District Bangalore.

Date of Arzi 14th June 1897

Date of Receipt 19th June 1897

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one.

Rev. Branch

Please put up Govt Pro: No 4087-94 referred to in the Petn (Para 4) & connected papers.

AK
26/6/97.

A printed copy of the Govt pro: no: 4087-94 dt 1st Nov 96 put up.

L.R. 95-95-5

26/6/97. Please put up circular connected papers

AK

Petn Br.

Original papers connected with Pro: No 4087-94 dt 1.11.96 are put up.

R 1406

28/6.

Petr practically asks for a review of the Govt Order of 1st November 1896

A pending case in which the order was discussed & in which the 3rd Councillor has passed remarks

Put up

Sd/- 2nd Councillor

28/6/97

Rd 7.15pm 1/7/97 Draft Circular calling for these papers with the Petition & connected papers

1/7/97

28/7/97

Whether the Petitioner is entitled to any other pension? Has he no any other

Certain

ABSTRACT.

States that he is the registered Shanboguy of Kandanahosahulli & four other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, and prays that orders may be given for the carrying on the duties of the said Shanboguy, by a Gumasta, till he is retired on pension and thus enabled to devote upon the duties of the Shanboguy for himself.

The enclosure of the

Jeans, a contract
from the diary is
called "Jeans", and
it is as follows:—

That sum of the
villages of the
Nandanaholahulli,
Chamboji Hobli, may be given
Lakshmi Narasappa
and the duties
connected with
them, may be
taken from his
brother Krishnappa

---

dd





Recd by dep't post
two rupees
stamp affxd.
BG
18/6/97

3636

IN THE COURT OF THE

Dewan and Councillors to

His Highness the Maharaja

of Mysore.

Revenue Petition No. *of* 1896–97.

Petitioner N. Lakshmi Narasappa Shanbough of Nandanahosahully, and other Villages in Sidlagutta Taluk, Kolar District, and a clerk in the Taluk Sub-registrar's office Bangaloro.

The humble petition of the said Lakshmi Narasappah most respectfully showeth.

1. That your humble petitioner is the registered shanbough of Nandanahosahully and four other villages in the Sidlagutta Taluk, Kolar District.

2. That one Seebiah the divided uncle of your petitioner was the shanbough of the said villages prior to 1884.

3. That as the said Seebiah was old and infirm, he used to get the duties of the office performed by his adopted son Narasappah on his responsibility.

4. That during the late dreadful Famine of 1878—79 the said Seebiah was himself in arrears to the extent of Rs. 700—0—0 or thereabouts on account of Kandayum payable by him to Government, for his private lands.

5. That in addition thereto, it was found, during the examination of the accounts, that the said Narasappah who was performing the duties of Shanbough-ship had failed to remit a snm of Rs. 328 which he had collected from the ryots.

6. That the said Seebiah who was the registardar and as such responsible for this deficit, found himself utterly unable to make good the said deficit as also to pay up the arrears due by him and consquently obtained the then Amildar's approval to get the deficit amount made good to Government by your hnmble petitioner.

7. That under these circumstances the aforesaid Seebiah solicited your humble petitioner who was at that time a Clerk in the Bangalore Sub Registrar's office on a salary of Rs. 15 per mensum to pay up the said amount of deficit to Government, adding that if otherwise, he would be entirely ruined and disgraced at the end of his life.

8. That it was with very great difficulty that your humble petitioner was then able to raise a loan of the said amount and he was obliged to borrow the amount at a high rate of interest,

9. That the amount of deficit was accordingly paid to Government by your petitioner in December 1883, and at the suggestion of the said Seebiah the registry of Seven of the eleven Villages of his group was then made out in the petitioner's name, as Seebiah had no nearer better relative, and as his adopted son had absconded for fear of being disgraced, and as the petitioner had helped Seebiah in making good the said deficit and thus saved him from further troubles.

10. That your humble petitioner had by that time put in nearly 11 years of Government service, in his appointment as a clerk.

11. That at the time of the registry of the Seven Villages in the name of your humble petitioner, the Amildar of Siddlaghatta Taluk duly reported to the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar, that your petitioner was unable to enter upon the duties of the Shanabougi office himself as he was already in Government employ and that the duties of the office had therefore to be performed by a Gumasta.

12. That the said arrangement was duly sanctioned by the Deputy Commissioner as per his Kanarese Order No. 437 dated the 17th February 1884, for a copy of which the petitioner has also applied.

13. That since your humble petitioner was registered as Shanbhough, not less then four of his Nominees have been duly approved by Governme-nt as Gumastas, from time to time, and no question of his right to such nomination has ever been raised.

14. That when the Amildar of Siddlaghatta Taluk prayed for the sanction of the appointment of the last of the petitioners Gumastas in 1895 the matter was brought before the Government by the then Deputy Commssioner of Kolar and the Government passed their proceedings No. 4087-94—1406 dated the 1st of November 1896, to the effect that your petitioner should either resign the office in favour of his next of kin, or give up his Government appointment and enter upon the duties of the Shanbogh office himself personally.

15. In pursuance of this Government order, the Amildar of Siddlaghatta Taluk has now served your humble petitioner with a notice directing him to present himself before the Taluk in view to the selection of a separate individual for the Shanbhog-ship, in case petitioner elects to retain his appointment as clerk at Bangalore.

16. That your humble petitioner has put in nearly 24 years of Government service and it would be very hard upon him, now to give up his Government service in favour of his Shanbogh office almost on the eve of retirement.

17. That your humble petitioner begs leave to submit that there are innumerable instances throughout the Mysore Province and also in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies where registered Shanbhogs who hold appointments in the Revenue and Judicial Departments have been getting the duties of the Shanbhog office performed by their Gumastas.

18. That the provisions contained in Para 5 Section XLIII of the Revenue Rules referred to by the Government in the aforesaid Proceedings, do not contemplate cases of the kind nor could this be made to take retrospective effect over an arrangement entered into in 1884, I. E., 6 years before the publication of the rules.

19. That in consideration of the circumstances stated above and having regard to the facts that,

(1). The Petitioner has already suffered much by paying a large sum towards making good the monies embezzled by the original Hakkdar;

(2). That he had to do so purely from charitable motives to help one of his aged relatives who was in great trouble.

(3). That at the time of his appointment as the registered shanbough he had put in 11 years of Government service and could not, therefore, be assumed to give up his Government appointment in favour of the shanbougi.

(4). That one of the prominent features of his accepting the shanbougship was the Government permitting him to have the duties discharged by his goomastas on his responsibility, till he could undertake it himself;

(5). That in this view he is supported by the fact that when the Deputy Commissioner first sanctioned his nomination, in order No. 4037 daled 17th Febrvary 1884, he clearly refers to the petitioner's name being registered for the shanbogi Huck and the duties thereof being conducted by a divided brother of petitioner (Kristnappah.)

(6). That latterly when owing to adverse circumstances this Goomasta and his successors were prevented from conducting the duties the petitioner has all along been given the choice of nominating his own men continuously during the past nearly 14 years.

(7) That Government have all along acquiesced in such nomination.

(8). That the said nominees have satisfactorily carried on the duties;

(9). That the petitioner's case has received a strong support by the fact that when in 1893 one of his nominees was appointed by Government, no objection such as the one now taken under para 5 Sect XLIII of the Revenue Rules was ever raised, though the same law was in full force at that time.

(10) That all these facts coupled with the peculiar circumstances under which the petitioner was nominated as the Registerdar go to show that he was led to believe and act upon the presumption that until such time as his other duties enabled him to enter upon the duties of shanboug-ship himself he would be permitted the choice of having the duties carried on by his Goomastas.

(11) That it would be very harsh *now* at a time when he has put in 24 years of unblemished service to give up his Government appointment in favour of the shanbough-ship.

(12) That several others like himself owning shanbouge Huck are at present in Government employ.

(13) And that your humble petitioner was unfortunately not given an opportunity to place these circumstances before Government when the Proceedings of November 1896 werepassed ;

The petitioner most respectfully begs that the old arrangements under which his goomastas have been carrying on the Shanbougi duties may be permitted for a few years more till such time as he may be enabled to retire on pension and take up the shanbougi himself.

For which act of Grace your Petitioner in duty bound will ever pray.

Your humble Petitioner begs to remain,

Your most obedient and humble servant,

Clerk sub Registar's Office,

Bangalore Taluk.

Bangalore

14th *June* 1897,

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೨೮

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೨೮

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೨೮

L.R. 165-97-జి.

L.R. 95-95-6

31-1-97

Refers first up.
Submitted
17/8
18/8/97

L.R. 103 97

.1897

No. 463 R.

Name of Petitioner La Krishnie Rama Regr Kralian Gennasta Bangal Palu

Village Bangalore

Taluk Bangalore.

District Bangalore.

Date of Arzi 9th August/97

Date of Receipt 11th August/97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil.

ABSTRACT.

Sales with reference to this office Endorsement No. 3636 of 29.7.97, that he has no undivided shares - that he has a loan of about 18 Years Jaga - and that he retained Government service on the 19.2.1873 and prays that he may be permitted to appear as Gennasta Pleader for him as Thambogne

L.L.
16/8/97

Put up to 2nd Counsellor with Appn-2nd (Contd)
M 23/8/97

R07 Pm
23.8.97

L.R. 95-95-7

RM 11897
References.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT OFFICE
PETITION OF APPEAL
REGD. No. 463.R
DATE 11 8 97

In the Court of the Dewan and
Councillors to His Highness
the Maharaja of
Mysore

In acknowledging the receipt of the
endorsement No. 3636 dated 29th July 1897
I the undersigned most respectfully beg
to submit that I have no undivided members
in my family, that I have an only son of about
18 years of age who is prosecuting his Studies in
one of the Schools here, that I was entertained in
the Government Service on the 19th February 1873,
when I was 20 years old.

2 (1) I may retire at my option with 1/20 of
after putting in 30 years qualified Service
(2) Or may be compelled to do so after comple
-ting my 60 years of age in which case it
will probably be after a lapse of 15 years
I am at present only 44 years old.

In submitting the above, I once again earnes
-tly entreat your Honor under the peculiar circum
-stances of my hard case to permit the continuance
of the option of appointing a Gumasta and thus
protect me and my poor family.

I beg to remain Sir
Your most obediant and humble
Servant.

Dated 9th August 1897
Bangalore

~~L.R. 103-97~~

L.R. 95-95-8

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read/Also

(1) Proc of the Govt of Mysore No. 4087-94 R. 1406 dt 1-11-96

Observing That the Lakshminarayappa karanavadar Shanbog & Nandan a hosahalli & 4 other villages can not be allowed to perform both duties by a deputy. both be in Govt service and continue to be the registered Shanbog performing his duties by a deputy.

on the subject of the Shanbhog Office of Nandanahosahalli and 4 other villages in the Shidlaghatta Taluk, stating that in the case of Lakshminarayappa the karanavadar of the above villages, now a clerk in the Bangalore Sub Registrar's Office, a karanavadar Shanbhog cannot both be in Govt service & continue to be the regd Shanbhog getting the duties of the Office performed by a servant.

Read

(2). Petn no 3636 dt 14/6/97 from the said Lakshminarayappa praying for the review of the Govt order read above.

(3) Petn. no 4630 dt 9/8/97 from Lakshminarayappa furnishing further information

person
from the same
stating on ~~receipt~~ the
Govt having inquired
him in Govt no 3686
of 31-7-97 that he
has a son of about
18 years of age and
that he entered Govt
service on 19-2-73
and praying that
he may be permitted
to appoint a Goomasta
to act for him as Shan-
bhog.

Ader thereon. No 5-861.
dt 7-8-98 dt 3-1-98
5

The Govt ~~directed~~ observe
that if the Petitioner
is willing, the usu bra-
~~dati~~ may be made
in the name of
his son, and as he
is only eighteen years old
& prosecuting
studies, a Goomasta
may be permitted

to do the work for him for a year or two within which time the Applt son should qualify himself fully and report himself for work. If the Petr is not willing he must abide by the order & already passed & must either report himself for duty or allow the land to pass on to the next heir.

Draft
Cr
BR.
22/12/97

[illegible] 28/12/97

To

Dy Com, Kolar District

L.R. 1437 ~~dt~~ ಫಾರಂ 40 / ಪ್ರಮಾಣಪತ್ರ

ಉಪವಿಭಾಗಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ
ಕಚೇರಿ

L.R-95-95-9

ವಿಷಯ:ಪ್ರಮಾಣಪತ್ರಕ್ಕಾಗಿ
ಅರ್ಜಿಸಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ
ತಿಳಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ - ~~ಸರ್ಕಾರದ~~ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ
ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 4-11-96 ರಂದು
ಸಿಂಧನೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ
ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿಸುವಂತೆ ಕೋರಿ
ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಆಕಾಇ 4087-94
1406
1-11-96 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಜ್ಞಾಪನ
ಪತ್ರ ದಿನಾಂಕ 31-7-97 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೂ
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 3636 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ
ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ
ಜ್ಞಾಪನ ಪತ್ರಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು
ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದೆ ~~ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದೆ~~ 19-2-73 ರಲ್ಲಿ
ಹೊಸ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು, ~~ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು~~
18 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದಿನ
ಅಂದರೆ 1955 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಂಧನೂರು

*

This is wrong. In Madras this Concession has been withdrawn recently by the Act of 1895. This has been made clear by a Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(2d) V. R. T. ~~L.R. 105-99~~ 15-6-99 ~~95-10~~ L.R. 95-95

Refer 7.4.99 463 of 97 G.O. No. 5861 / P. 798 of 3-1-98

Rec'd 7/4/99

Rev. Br.

Please put G.O. No. 5861 / P. 798 of 3-4-98. and connected papers. which were sent to your Branch on 17-10-98 with G.L. No: 2534 / R. 1468 of 7-10-98 from D.C. Chunnya, No: 327 / 265.

AK 17.4.99.

Rd on 20.4.99.

Rev. Br.

1/ Two Rs Stamp affixed

2/ Is a 2d application for review of Govt order No 4087-94 / R 1406 of 1st Nov 96 as also of the subsequent order No 5861 / P 798-8 of 3.4.98.

Fit for 2nd Committee with Presents Cont. 22/4/99

Open file

1899

No. 1685

Name of Petitioner N. Lakshminarasa Shanbhog of Nandanahosahally Clerk. Inspect General of Registration

Village

Taluk

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 14. 4. 99

Date of Receipt 15. 4. 99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Petn in one book with 6 annexures marked I II III &c

ABSTRACT

This is a petition for review of post order No 3636-463 of 29.12.97. The grounds of review

2. That there are many instances in the Madras & Bombay Presidencies, in which hereditary offices have by reason of holding Govt. appointments, been permitted to employ Gumastas for Shanbhog work,

6.) That there has been no case in which a registering Mukdar has been asked

that on the contrary several persons holding high offices also retain their hereditary hukks, the duties of such being performed by Gumastas duly appointed that the Bombay Vatandars Act permits of similar appointments being made that the omission of such a provision in Supreme Rev: Law may not in itself be sufficient to force a hukdar to resign his hukk and especially so when it is purchased at great cost that when there is a concession in favour of widows & minors granting them the right to appoint Gumastas, it such Concession negatives completely the fact of the right to the Shanbhogi office & being inseparable from the efficient discharge of its duties; but the on the other hand it gives additional reason for extending the Concession that, as this is a matter yet undecided in the Representative Assembly it is a doubtful one

Pet: 1685

g. That he can not leave his Govt: appointment at this late hour, as he is not fit for pension having put in only 24 years' service, and being well in health; that his son does not like to continue his studies, that it will be very injurious to his future prospects, that he (petr) is working at a loss having to pay Rs 40 for the Gumasta and getting nothing in return from the Inam lands and that he would get into the Shanbhogi office as soon as he is retired from Govt: Service.

Prays that he may be allowed the concession of appointing a Gumasta till he retires.

L.S.G.





Two Rupees stamp affixed my

Box 7 Pet Branch 15/4/99

C. SREENIVASIENGAR, Esq.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

BANGALORE.
MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
REG'D. No. 1685R
DATE 16-4-99

The humble petition of N. Lakshminarasappa Shanbogue of Nandanahosahally and other villages in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, Kolar District, and a Clerk in the Office of the Inspector General of Registration Bangalore.

SHOWETH :—

1. That the Office of Shanbhogueship of the aforesaid villages originally appertained to one Seebiah a divided uncle of petitioner.

2. That owing to misappropriation of certain Government monies recovered by the aforesaid Seebia's son, who was discharging the duties on behalf of his father who was old and infirm, sanction of Government was, at Seebia's request, obtained to get the amount made good by the present petitioner who was an unconnected divided member of the family and who had his own resources of living as a Government Official.

3. That the petitioner had not any specific object in paying this amount other than purely charitable intentions and a compliance with the repeated prayers of his uncle that if timely aid was not afforded to him, he would be ruined and disgraced at the eve of his life by a criminal prosecution.

4. That with great difficulty petitioner raised a loan of the amount so misappropriated and paid the same to Government in the year 1883; and in consideration of such payment and the earnest prayer of Seebiah, the Shanbogue registry of 7 out of the 11 villages belonging to him came to be transferred to petitioner's name for the *first* time.

5. That on the occasion of the transfer of the registry of these villages as above, the Government authorities were fully aware of the fact of the petitioner being already in the employ of Government and of his consequent inability to enter upon the duties of the Shanbogue office *personally* and of the only alternative being to have such duties discharged by a Gumasta nominated by the petitioner.

6. That these circumstances were even fully reported by the then Amildar of Sidlaghatta Taluk in his No. 545 dated on 17th February 1884 (**Vide Appendix I**) to the Deputy Commissioner of Kolar, who, in his order No. 437 dated 17th February 1884 (**Vide Appendix II**) sanctioned the petitioner's name being registered as Shanbogue with the privilege of getting the duties discharged by his brother Krishnappa.

7. That in pursuance of the permission so benevolently accorded and in accordance with the practice prevalent throughout the province generally, the petitioner has from the past *16 years* had the duties of the Shanbogi office discharged by Gumastas whom he has been choosing from time to time as necessity arose owing to disablement or otherwise, the Government approving of such nominations.

8. That in the year 1895 the petitioner's Gumasta wished to be relieved of the Gumastaship on account of some inconvenience and the petitioner was called upon

by Government to nominate a separate individual for the work, but on the matter going before the Deputy Commissioner for final approval, the Deputy Commissioner feeling doubtful as to whether he was acting within the powers conferred by the Revenue Law, in the absence of any special provision therein as to whether a registerdar could be permitted to appoint a Gumasta by reason of his being prevented from attending to the Shanbogui work in consequence of his employment under Government, referred the matter to the Government for orders.

9. That after some correspondence between the Government and the Deputy Commissioner in which it was brought to the notice of Government that the petitioner was all along given the privilege of employing a Gumasta for an indefinite time without any forfeiture of his huk to the Shanbougi Office, the Government, to petitioner's misfortune, was pleased to decide that the registry of the name of a person as an Officiator Shanbogue was not an honorary distinction, that the right to the Shanbougi office was inseparable from the efficient discharge of duties connected therewith the only exception being in the case of minors or widows, and that as in the present case the officiator Shanbogue (Petitioner) had no such disability, he could not be permittted to absent himself for employment elsewhere, and that if petitioner preferred to remain in Government service he should resign the Shanbougi huk to next of kin. This proceedings of Government is printed as **Appendix III.**

10. That by this decision the petitioner who had put in 24 years of Government service had either to give up his appointment under Government even which he could not do under the pension rules not having completed the required term of service nor could he be invalidated as he was within the age limit and physically fit, or, forego altogether his right to the Shanbougi office which he had obtained in consideration of his making good large sums that his uncle's son had misappropriated and about which he had the assurance of Government (as will be evident by a reference to the Amildar's first report and the Deputy Commissioner's order thereon printed as Appendices I and II followed by 16 yerrs of actual working) that he would be permitted to continue to employ a Gumasta for an indefinite time without forfeiting his right to the Shanbougi office.

11. That the petitioner thereupon submitted a Review application (printed as **Appendix IV**) setting forth in detail his grievances and the injustice done to him and the grounds upon which his prayers were based. But to his great misfortune his prayer was not heard and the Government in their second order No. 3636—463 dated 29th December 1897 only modified the first to the extent of permitting him to have the Shanbogui duties carried on through a Gumasta for the short limited period of a year or two within which his son now aged 18 years should qualify himself and enter upon the Shanbougi duties; and that otherwise the petitioner should either take up the duties himself or alienate it in favour of another. (This order is printed as **Appendix V.**)

12. That although the petitioner is debarred in due course of law from again seeking a reversion or revision of the aforesaid orders which are final and conclusive, still, as an unparalled injustice has unfortunately been done in his case, by an order opposed to precedents and existing practice, the petitioner humbly ventures to make this attempt at once again laying his grievances at your honor's feet, in the hope that

at least now, his case would receive the consideration it deserves; and in so doing, humbly begs to submit the following among the many other grounds already represented :—

a. That there have been innumerable instances not only in Mysore but also in the neighbouring Presidencies of Madras and Bombay in which hukdars holding heriditary offices, have by reason of their services under Government, or other causes, been prevented from taking up the Shanbougi duties themselves, are permitted to employ Gumastas on their behalf, who are directly responsible to Government for the efficient discharge of the duties appertaining to it.

b. That neither during the days of the British commission nor subsequent to the Rendition has there been any case in which an order making it obligatory on the part of a registered hukdar to take up the duties himself *personally* or *resign* the huk in favour of another, has been passed; on the contrary the existing practice under which several holding even high offices under Government, also retain their hereditary huks the duties being performed by Gumastas on their behalf, negatives any ideas of such restrictions being imposed by Government.

c. That in such a supposition petitioner is fortified by the provisions of the Bombay Law Sections 42-45 and 55 of the Bombay Vatandari Act in which the appointment of a Gumasta is permitted when the registerdar is in the service of Government.

d. That the fact of the omission of a similar provision in the Mysore Revenue Law could not, the petitioner humbly ventures to submit, be sufficient to force a hukdar to resign his right in favour of another merely because he is prevented from taking up the work himself personally; nor could it be made to apply to petitioner who was so to say forced to purchase a right at great expense and under peculiar circumstances.

e. That the special provision contained in the Revenue law in favour of widows and minors to whom the privilege of employing a Gumasta has been conceded negatives completely the presumption that the right to the Shanbogui office is inseparable from the efficient discharge of its duties while it strongly favours the liberal and enlightened policy of the Government of allowing, where equitable, a similar concession to others.

f. That the order in question affecting the competency of a registered holder to appoint a Gumasta when prevented from taking up the duties himself seems almost to have been felt as a general grievance as will be evident from a perusal of the discussions at the Dasara Meeting of 1897 (**Vide Appendix VI**). The Government have in response to these representations for the removal of the new restrictions, benevolently noted the matter for their favourable consideration and the petitioner hopes that this case will at least be viewed as one coming within the category of these discussions and will be treated with some consideration.

g. That in the petitioner's case he has been in the employ of Government from many years previous to his obtaining the Shanbogi huk: the Government when they received from the petitioner the sums misappropriated by the original holder's son, were fully cognizant of it; they were equally aware of the fact that the petitioner could not fore go his Government appointment with higher income and better prospects to that of the Shanbogue office till his retirement; the Amildar even took the liberty of placing the matter on record; and the Deputy Commissioner sanctioned the proposal to nominate another for the work; subsequent to the arrangement petitioner has continuously nominated from time to time as occasion arose no less than four Gumastas: the Government have never in a single instance raised the objection which they have now unfortunately applied to petitioner's case notwithstanding that the same laws and rules continue in force; the petitioner has thus received the fullest assurance of Government that so long as he continues in Government service he would be allowed the privilege of having a Gumasta for the Shanbogue duties; in spite of all these, it is a question as to why the petitioner should not be granted the concession of employing his Gumasta for the few remaining years required for his retirement from service.

h. That to entrust the huk to petitioner's son as ordered by Governmnet in the last order, it would the petitioner humbly submits, be ruining his further advancement. Petitioner's son is still very young, is making a rapid progress in his education and is highly anxious to continue it till he attains some proficiency and to stunt him at so early an age and train him for a village Shanbogue's duties against his wishes would be blasting all his prospects. But if Government even now insists upon such a thing being done petitioner would have implicitly to obey or make other arrangements.

i. That apart from the question of law or procedure involved in petitioner's case he particularly begs to say that he has already been a heavy sufferer by making good a comparatively heavy sum to Government and has been paying a sum of Rs. 40 per annum to the Gumasta without any return whatsoever in asmuchas the Inam lands remain uncultivated for want of sufficient personal supervision and timely rainfall. The petitioner is anxious to assume the Shanbogue office himself immediately after retirement from public service in the course of the next few years if the privilege so generously conceded to him by Government during the past 16 years of employing his Gumasta till then is continued to him some time longer.

13. In conclusion petitioner humbly begs your honors perusal of the records and several appendices attached hereto and should this his last and only appeal for redress seem justifiable, he begs that the arrangement originally sanctioned and all along continued of employing a Gumasta to discharge the Shanbogue duties till such time as petitioner retires from service and takes it up himself, be orderd to be continued in his case in modification of the orders of November 1896.

Petitioner begs to remain
your honour's most
obedient Servant.

BANGALORE,
1*st January* 1899.

14th April 1899

Copy

26/4/99

1685-98 Submitted for 2nd Councillor on 22-4-99

26/4/99

L.R. 103-97-10

Subd to 2nd Councillor,

The previous petn referred to was subd on 22-4-99

27.4.99

L.R. 98-95-11 R.R. 27.4.99

R.R. 4 Pm 29.4.99

I have had this before me numerous times without success - Many enquiries

reasons no further orders are necessary

30.4.99

OK 2/5/99

Place along with connected papers

R.R. 2.5.99

1899

No. 1720

Name of Petitioner L. Lakshmi Narasappa Vernacular Clerk, I.G. of Registration Office

Village

Taluk Bangalore.

District

Date of Arzi 21.4.99

Date of Receipt 24.4.99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 1

ABSTRACT

In continuation of his previous petition of 14.4.99 the petitioner states that in support of the statement made in para 12 (a) he has submitted a detailed list of Govt officers holding hereditary offices and getting the work of such offices performed by farmers & that the points for re are the following: viz that the Dy Comr. Kn

he was employed in some
other Govt work, that he has
allowed him to continue
to hold his place for the
last 12 years, ~~through his~~
~~favourable~~; ~~that~~ whether
his long enjoyment should
be disturbed at this late
hour; what the reason was
for taking the money from him,
and for showing him the con-
cession that has been hitherto
to shown to him, and whether
the petitioner would not sustain
a loss if he is not granted his
~~the~~ prayer.

Prays that the records of the
Case be studied and order
passed or that he be allowed
to represent his Case through
a Lawyer

Enclosure:
A Statement of officers
holding Govt appointment
and at the same time
enjoying hereditary office

Copy / Inst Brief 24/4/91

Ref 24.4.91

మైసూరు గవర్నమెంట్, బి: ఫిర్యాదుదారి మ॥శ్రీ
బి-శ్రీనివాస అయ్యంగార్ శవర కుప్పిదానకే

మైసూరు రిజిస్ట్రేషన్ ఇలాఖా యిన్‌స్పెక్టర్ జనరల్ వరద ఆఫీసు-
వనార్ప్పులర్‌క్లర్క్. h లక్ష్మీనరసప్ప బరచు

MYSORE GOVERNMENT OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 17201
DATE 24-4-91

ఫిర్యాదుమెంటే. అర్జీ

కోలార్ డిస్ట్రిక్ట్ హొస్కోట్ తాలూక్ నందనహొగనకన్నహళ్ళి
గ్రామగళ శ్రోత్రభూమి రిజిస్టర్. 1884నే యిసవి యి బరవరిగింగళల్లి
నంనకబరిగెదారులు మాడి నంనకడెగు మాస్తే యిందకలసకెగదుహో
క్రుర్తా బరరేక్కదేందు. డిప్టి కమిషనర్ వరరు. క్రయం హొట్టిరువ
ప్రకార ఆలాగాయిరు. గానూ. నంనకడెగు మాస్తే యిందకలస
నడిసుక్రుర్తా బందు యిరువదరల్లి. ఈ బగె. డిప్టి కమిషనర్ వరరు
గవర్నమెంట్ బగె. రిజిస్టర్. మాడిద్దరవల్లి 1896నే యిసవి నవంబర్
1నే కారియిసలు 4087. 94-1406నే నంబర్. ప్రొసీడింగ్స్ ఆగియి
రువప్రకార - - - - - - -

ఈ ప్రొసీడింగ్స్ బదలాయిసబేకేంకలు. యిదక్కె కత్తె
కొంగుగళన్నకురిచు యిరువ దినంగళు 14నే కారియిసలు - నానుమంనిదా
నక్కే కొట్టు యిరువ ప్రకార్డెడ్ అర్జీయ జొతెగె యి కిళగినవమూది
నువ కారణంగళన్న బయవిట్టు యిం బహు-నిగె కరబేకు —

(1) ప్రకటిసిదే. అర్జీదారను 12నే కలమిన (a) పారాదల్లి నమూదిసి.
యిరువ. అంశ. నిజవేందు కోర్టు నిర్ణయిసలుద్దిశ్యదరాం బరిశీలి
యిదక్క వడగె. వందు స్పెషల్ మేట్ హాజరు మాడియిదేనే-

(2) 1884నే యిసవియల్లి. నానుసరకారద నాకరియల్లి. యిరుత్త
వనేందు డిప్టి కమిషనర్ వరరంగె. బరవనిగె మూలక కిర్యాదు -
బందు యిద్దరూ. నిరాక్షేపనేయరాగి బహుకాల దింద —

నడుచుబండులు ఉరువనడవళ్ళకే అనుమతిస్తూ [illegible]
అధికారం అవసరాన్ని బట్టి మార్పు చేయడానికి
(12) వరుస్సగళళ్ళ కాలాజారిగే బందు యిరుక్కే —

3 ఈగ ఆ కుళకు వున్న మేల్మండ ప్రొటెక్ట్ చేస్తున్నందుకు
లాయిసలు కార్గుమిలు వాదద్దే వుర్తు సకారంలవే?

4 అజీదాంశనవన్ను తిరిగి తిజస్టర్ మాడువాగ అవ్యక్తదార్రు
డిప్పే కమిషనర్ వరు అజీదారనింద సరకారదవాగిరువన్ను
కేవదు కొళ్ళలు కార్గూ వేనెంబుళదు? వుర్తు ఆ రీతియ
యక్తియన్ను యిదువరిగినడిసి కొండుబిడిసంబువదు?

5 ఈగ అజీదాను కేళి కొళ్ళువ ప్రకారదల్లి మాడి
కుళ్ళం కొడదే యిద్దరి ఈ కరనిగే నష్టవేనూ యిల్లవే
యుంబువదు?

యీ అంశగళు అపీదాళ్ళ వాదద బిట్టకేళిశరబేళ్ళలవే యిన్న
కేలవు అంశగళు అవళిగే వాదద రికారుగళు కూశిరువుదు
రూబిరుమ్మేళ కొళ్ళలు అదిన కుళ్ళ లాంఛుర వుూలక్తు నిగ్గ
నడల్లు అరికే మాడి కొళ్ళలు అవకాశకొడిసి కొంరికే ప్రకార
కుళ్ళం దయపొ అసి లుద్దేశమాడబేకెందు ప్రార్థిసుత్తేనే —

దినాంక 21 నే ఏప్రిల్ 1899 నేయిసవి.

M. లక్ష్మీనరసింహయ్య

5-5-99

L.R. 103-97

A-R. 95-95-12

ఉత్తర్వులు